

Appl. No. 10/658,571  
Amdt. Dated November 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of August 2, 2005

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further consideration of the claims under 37 CFR 1.116. Applicants have not amended the claims, and no new matter has been raised. Rather, Applicants submit that neither reference raised by the Examiner teaches or suggests the subject matter of the independent claims.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Examiner's rejection of claims 1 - 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Examiner has rejected these claims in view of the cited prior art references of *Taniguchi et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,239,228) and *Yakio* (Jap. Pat. Pub. No. 05-182759). The *Taniguchi* reference is directed to "a thin-film EL device adapted to display multiple colors and having a sealing plate which can be fixed to a substrate without affecting picture element with adhesive squeezed out." (Column 1, line 65 - Column 2, line 2).

*Taniguchi*, however, actually teaches away from Applicants' currently claimed invention, and therefore cannot be used to form an obviousness rejection in combination with the *Yakio* reference. Furthermore, *Taniguchi* teaches away from the formation of resin over the light-emitting area in order to improve light transmittance, and therefore cannot be combined with a reference which teaches the formation of resin over the light-emitting area in order to form an obviousness rejection. See *In re Grasselli*, 713 F.2d 731, 743, 218 USPQ 769, 779 (Fed. Cir. 1983) ("It is improper to combine references where the references teach away from their combination.")

Appl. No. 10/658,571  
Amtd. Dated November 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of August 2, 2005

*Taniguchi* teaches the formation of a void 50 over the light-emitting region and the non-formation of adhesive sealant over the same region in order to improve transmittance of the device. The adhesive 52 is thus formed outside of the light-emitting region, and the relief pattern 53 is formed to prevent the adhesive from being squeezed inwards and over the light-emitting region, thereby preventing a decrease in light transmittance. (See Column 7, line: 28 – 34). Therefore, the *Taniguchi* reference fails to teach or suggest the formation of relief portion in order to prevent resin from flowing out to the electrode region, as currently claimed. Applicant's invention is directed to preventing the leakage of resin to the outer electrode region and the resultant defects in the connection between the external electrodes 4 and the external terminals 5 (See page 4 of Applicant's written disclosure).

More specifically, Applicants' invention is directed to an EL device wherein a sealing resin is formed over the entire light-emitting area in order to further seal the LEDs from elements such as moisture and oxygen that could degrade the device and reduce device reliability. However, there has been a problem in the art that the sealing resin disposed over the light-emitting region will, when squeezed between the sealing substrate and the panel substrate, leak out into the electrode region, causing device degradation, as shown in Fig. 1C of Applicants' disclosure and discussed in the 1<sup>st</sup> full paragraph on page 3 of Applicant's written specification.

Applicants have solved this problem by forming a relief in the sealing substrate outside of the light-emitting region in order to capture and prevent sealing resin 2 from

Appl. No. 10/658,571  
Amdt. Dated November 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of August 2, 2005

leaking out and causing electrical discontinuity. *Taniguchi* fails to teach or suggest such a device.

Accordingly, because *Taniguchi* teaches away from Applicant's currently claimed invention, Applicant's respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection must be withdrawn, and all claims placed in condition for allowance.

Further in regard to claims 3 and 7, Applicants submit that the through hole 53 of which the Examiner refers to is a gas outlet / oil fill hole. This element cannot qualify as a relief portion, as any resin which would extend into this hole would prevent the escape of gas and/or the filling of oil, of which the specification clearly requires of this element.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the Examiner's characterization of through hole 53 as a portion of the relief portion comprising a "plurality of holes" is entirely unsupported by the *Taniguchi* specification. In light of the foregoing, Applicants further submit that for at least this reason too, claims 3 and 7 are allowable over the cited prior art.

Further in regard to claims 4 and 8, Examiner states that "Moisture absorption agents must have an affinity for water molecules. Therefore, whether the absorption agent is a powder or a gel the surface will be roughened so as to absorb as much water as possible." Applicants are unclear where the Examiner finds support for this statement, as they were unable to locate such language in the *Taniguchi* reference. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner point out what reference he/she is basing such an assertion on or, in the alternative, whether the Examiner is asserting "official notice." As Applicant's are unable to

Appl. No. 10/658,571  
Amdt. Dated November 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of August 2, 2005

locate such a requirement in the *Taniguchi* reference, Applicants submit that for this reason also, claims 4 and 8 are allowable over the cited prior art.

Finally, in the last Office Actions' Response to Arguments section, the Examiner stated that "The groove 53 is provided to catch excess oil that is squeezed. The groove achieves the instant applicant's goal of collection of excess material that is provided over the display region." Applicants respectfully refute Examiner's characterization of the *Taniguchi* reference. As discussed above, *Taniguchi* clearly teaches that the groove 53 prevents resin 52 from flowing inward, and actually teaches away from Applicant's invention. Furthermore, *Taniguchi* clearly teaches that the insulation oil 50 is filled in through the hole 54 after the sealing glass plate is attached to the substrate via the resin 52 and the structure is squeezed. Accordingly, Examiner's statement fails to find any support in the *Taniguchi* reference and must be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/658,571  
Amdt. Dated November 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of August 2, 2005

Examiner's remaining references cited but not relied upon, considered either alone or in combination, also fail to teach applicant's currently claimed invention. In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now stand in condition for allowance.

Date: 11/5/05

Respectfully submitted,

(Reg. #37,607)

Robert J. Depke  
**TREXLER, BUSHNELL, GIANGIORGI  
BLACKSTONE & MARR, LTD.**  
105 W. Adams Street, 36<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60603  
Tel: (312) 704-1890  
Attorney for Applicants

page 9 of 9